

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
MARTINSBURG**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 3:04-CR-40-**

**1**

**(BAILEY)**

**ROZELL ALONZA JOHNSON,**

Defendant.

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

On this day, the above-styled matter came before the Court for consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge James E. Seibert. By Order entered on April 30, 2008, this action was referred to Magistrate Judge Seibert for submission of proposed report and a recommendation ("R & R"). Magistrate Judge Seibert filed his R & R on May 29, 2008 [Doc. 182]. In that filing, the magistrate judge recommended that this Court deny the Motion to Defer Fine Until Supervised Release as moot.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1) (c), this Court is required to make a *de novo* review of those portions of the magistrate judge's findings to which objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. ***Thomas v. Arn***, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). In addition, failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1);


**Snyder v. Ridenour**, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); **United States v. Schronce**, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). Here, objections to Magistrate Judge Seibert's R & R were due within ten (10) days after being served with a copy of the R & R pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b). To date, neither party has filed objections. Accordingly, this Court will review the R & R for clear error.

Having reviewed the record and the magistrate judge's R & R, it is the opinion of this Court that the recommendations of Magistrate Judge Seibert **[Doc. 182]** should be, and are, hereby **ORDERED ADOPTED** for reasons more fully stated in that report. As such, the Court hereby **DENIES** the defendant's Motion to Defer Fine Until Supervised Release **[Doc. 170]**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

The Clerk is directed to transmit copies of this Order to all counsel of record and to mail a copy to the *pro se* petitioner.

**DATED:** June 30, 2008.

  
JOHN PRESTON BAILEY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE